

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 are pending. Claim 1 is amended herein.

103 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lobodzinski et al. ("Lobodzinski," U.S. Patent No. 5,734,873) in view of Larson (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,199). The Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-54 is not anticipated or shown by Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully agrees with the statement in the instant Office Action that Lobodzinski does not disclose a second memory as recited in independent Claims 1, 26 and 48.

Applicant respectfully submits that Larson does not overcome the shortcomings of Lobodzinski. Larson describes a graphics processor 100 that includes a register file 135. However, the register file 135 of Larson is for holding instructions received from an instruction buffer 155.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present claimed invention recited in independent Claims 1, 26 and 48. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest a second memory "dedicated to holding

information read from the font array” (emphasis added) as recited in independent Claim 1. Also, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the specific step of “placing the information read from the font array in a second memory resident on a graphics controller” as recited in independent Claim 26. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest a specific step in which “glyph information for a character to be rendered, said size width information and said size height information are read to registers that reside on said graphics controller” as recited in independent Claim 48.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Lobodzinski and Larson, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 26 and 48. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 26 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed, and that Claims 1, 26 and 48 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-25 are dependent on Claim 1; Claims 27-47 are dependent on Claim 26; and Claims 49-54 are dependent on Claim 48. As such, Applicant respectfully submits the basis for rejecting Claims 2-25, 27-47 and 49-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also traversed, as Claims 2-25, 27-47 and 49-54 are dependent on allowable base claims and recite additional limitations.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-54 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these claims.


The Applicant has reviewed the reference cited but not relied upon, and did not find this reference to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. Patent No. 5,793,386.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Date: 11/12/04

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



William A. Zarbis

Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060